



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/574,840

01/19/2007

Hideki Kitano

Q94324

5035

23373 7590 04/28/2011
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

VERDERAME, ANNA L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1722

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/28/2011

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com
PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM
USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/574,840	Applicant(s) KITANO ET AL.
	Examiner ANNA L. VERDERAME	Art Unit 1722

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 April 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |
|---|--|

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment filed on 2/14/2011 has been carefully considered. A response is presented below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-10, and 12 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitano WO 03/032305(US 2004 0257972 used as an English language translation).

Kitano discloses a photo-curable transfer sheet.

The limitations of claim 2 are taught at (0091) and (0166) respectively

The limitations of claim 3-4 are taught at (0092).

The limitations of claims 5-6 are taught at (0090).

The limitations of claims 7-9 are taught at 0164-0167.

Note that the composition formed in applicant's specification at 0283-0286 is identical to that formed in the Kitano reference at 0164-0167 except that the applicant has added a tackifier. Note the results of tests with the sheet taught at 0283-0286 in table 2. Also note the "b" value taught in table 2 which meets the limitation of claim 1. Composition 5 taught by applicant is identical to that taught in Kitano except for the addition of a tackifier. Kitano discloses addition of the same tackifiers as applicant in an amount sufficient to improve the processing properties of the adhesive and thus the adhesive of Kitano having these tackifiers added will inherently meet the limitations of claim 1.

Applicant cites examples of tackifiers at 0186. Addition of additives including rosins, terpene resins etc(identical to the tackifiers taught by applicant at 0186) are taught in the Kitano reference at (0108). These are disclosed as being capable of improving the processing properties such as the laminating properties of the adhesive. This disclosure meets the limitations of claim 10.

It would have been obvious to add any of the additives(disclosed by applicant to be suitable tackifiers) disclosed at 0108 including rosins and terpene resins to the photo-curable transfer sheet disclosed at 0164-0167 based on the disclosure to do so at 0108 and with the reasonable expectation of success in improving the processing properties such as the laminating properties of the adhesive.

Art Unit: 1722

3. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitano WO 03/032305(US 2004 0257972 used as an English language translation) In view of Takamatsu US 6,586,496.

With regard to claims 11 Kitano recites addition of particles of silica gel, calcium carbonate or silicone copolymer but does not recite the size of these particles. Takamatsu discloses a photo-curable resin composition further comprising an inorganic filler such as silica or calcium carbonate having an average particle size in the range from 0.005 to 10 micrometers(.5-10,000 nm)(10/1-21) These fillers act to provide the cured resin with a resistance to moisture, adhesive strength and thixotropy.

It would have been obvious to add fillers to the photo-curable composition of Kitano based on the disclosure to do so at for example 0111 and to have these particles have a size of .5 to 300 nm based on the use of particles having this size in the photo-curable composition taught by Takamatsu and with the reasonable expectation of obtaining the benefits taught by Takamatsu including forming a cured resin having resistance to moisture, adhesive strength and thixotropy.

4. Claims 11 and 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitano WO 03/032305(US 2004 0257972 used as an English language translation) in view of Hojo et al. US 2003/0129385.

With regard to claims 11 Kitano recites addition of particles of silica gel, calcium carbonate or silicone copolymer but does not recite the size of these particles.

Kitano also discloses addition of an aging resistant agent which functions like applicants phenol compound described in applicant's specification at (0208-0210).

Hojo discloses a photo-curable resin composition for forming an embossed pattern therein wherein the resin composition contains an inhibitor such as hydroquinone in the amount of 0.1 to 0.3% by weight(0175). Hojo et al also discloses addition of inorganic fine particles such as silica which have a particle size from 1-300 nm(0140 and 0142,0144). Using bulky superfine particles in the photo-curable resin composition can cause improvements in creep characteristics and retention of embossed patterns(0143).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the photo-curable resin composition taught by Kitano by adding a photo-inhibitor such as hydroquinone in order to improve the shelf-stability of the photo-curable resin as taught by Hojo et (0175).

Further it would have been obvious to add inorganic fine particles having a size of 1 to 300 nm based on the disclosure in Kojo et al. that adding these particles results in improved creep characteristics and retention of embossed patterns.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 1722

5. The arguments submitted on 2/14/2011 have been carefully considered but are unpersuasive. Applicant notes that the composition in applicant's specification meeting the limitations of claim 1 contains the tackifier and that the composition in Kitano does not and so the composition cannot meet the limitations of claim 1. This, applicant argues, is especially true because the comparative composition in the specification does not contain the tackifier and does not meet the limitations. However, applicant fails to take into account the teaching in Kitano to add tackifiers like those disclosed by applicant in order to improve the processing properties of the adhesive. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the composition of Kitano not containing any tackifier by adding said tackifier in an amount sufficient to achieve the improved processing properties. This adhesive will inherently meet the limitations of claim 1.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANNA L. VERDERAME whose telephone number is (571)272-6420. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8A-4:30P.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cynthia Kelly can be reached on (571)272-1526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1722

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kathleen Duda/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1722

/Anna L Verderame/

Examiner, Art Unit 1722